

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,469	04/23/2001	Rodger Williams	2400-667	1931
27820	7590 11/09/2004		EXAMINER	
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.			SHAPIRO, JEFFERY A	
P.O. BOX 128	-			DARENARA (DED
CARY, NC	27512		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3653	
			DATE MAIL ED. 11/00/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ι,				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	09/840,469	WILLIAMS ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Jeffrey A. Shapiro	3653					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence addres	is				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stal Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl reply within the statutory minimum of thirty ( od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed  30) days will be considered timely. IS from the mailing date of this commu	inication.				
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25	5 August 2004.						
	his action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allow		s, prosecution as to the me	erits is				
closed in accordance with the practice unde	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
<ul> <li>4)</li></ul>	rawn from consideration.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a							
Applicant may not request that any objection to t							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the		·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Burn	ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been reeau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No eceived in this National Sta	ge				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a I  Attachment(s)	ist of the certified copies not re	eceived.					
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sur	mmary (PTO-413)					
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/	Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)				

Application/Control Number: 09/840,469

Art Unit: 3653

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-21 and 28-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coppola et al (US 6,360,138 B1) in view of Devine et al (US 6,763,376 B1) and further in view of Kohut et al (US 6,338,008 B1).

Coppola discloses a fuel dispensing system (10) with graphics display (72) and a browser (see col. 6, lines 66-67 and col. 7, lines 1-3.

Coppola does not expressly disclose, but Devine discloses an integrated customer interface system (200) with a single display controller (see "Frame NAT/Router) in figure 2. Note that Applicant's display controller is equivalent to the Frame NAT/Router, since it is taking the web information having a unique address and directing it to either of the browsers by a unique port ID. This is how this system must work.

Coppola does not expressly disclose, but Kohut discloses a fuel dispenser having two points of sale on opposing sides of the dispenser.

Both Coppola and Devine are considered to be analogous because Coppola describes a fuel dispenser with web browsers while Devine describes a single router which services multiple browsers.

Application/Control Number: 09/840,469

Art Unit: 3653

Both Coppola and Kohut are analogous art because they both concern fuel

dispensing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art to have used a single router to direct web information from an application with a

particular address to one of several connected browsers with a unique port identifier on

a fuel dispenser having two points of sale, and therefore two browsers.

The suggestion/reason would have been to connect multiple browsers through a

single router to the internet/web, as one ordinarily skilled in the art would recognize from

figure 2.

The suggestion/reason for using two points of sale on a single fuel dispenser

would have been to increase throughput of the fuel station, as one ordinarily skilled in

the art would recognize.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Coppola, Kohut and Devine in

order to obtain the invention as described in Claims 1, 4-9, 11-21 and 28-33.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Hakim (US 6,760,748 B1), Clark (US 6,445,777 B1) and O'Toole

et al (US 6,757,723 B1) are cited as being further examples of multiple web

browsers/clients having a router/display controller.

DONALD FLATER AMINER

Page 3

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Application/Control Number: 09/840,469 Page 4

Art Unit: 3653

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey A. Shapiro whose telephone number is (703)308-3423. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00 AM-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Donald P. Walsh can be reached on (703)306-4173. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeffrey A. Shapiro

Examiner

Art Unit 3653

November 4, 2004